

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed July 19, 2005, in which the Examiner withdrew claims 2, 4-8, 19-22, 34 and 35, allowed claims 15-18 and 23-33, rejected claims 1 and 9-14, and objected to claim 3. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

In Section 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 9-12 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Lahiri et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,510,022).

Applicant has made an editorial amendment to independent claim 1 to clarify a significant difference between the method of the present invention and the cited reference. In general, Applicant has amended claim 1 to describe the increasing thickness of the writing pole portion in a manner that is neither taught nor suggested by the cited reference.

The rounded portion of the cited writing pole portion (90 and 104) of Lahiri et al. varies the thickness of the writing pole portion adjacent the air bearing surface (160) along a plane that is parallel to the air bearing surface, as shown in FIG. 16. Additionally, the beveled portion of the cited writing pole portion of Lahiri et al. has a constant thickness from the air bearing surface along a plane that is perpendicular to the air bearing surface. The resultant shape of the yoke 104 decreases side writing in the magnetic head relative to magnetic heads of the prior art (col. 6, lines 26-33).

Thus, Lahiri et al. fail to disclose a method of forming a beveled writing pole of a perpendicular writing element that includes a step of “defining a pole tip of the writing pole portion having an air bearing surface and a thickness substantially corresponding to a thickness of the top portion, wherein the beveled portion increases a thickness of the writing pole portion along a plane that is perpendicular to the air bearing surface”, as described in independent claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 1 is not anticipated by the cited reference, and requests that the rejection be withdrawn. Additionally, Applicant submits that all claims depending from claim 1 are allowable as being dependent from an allowable base claim.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

In Section 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lahiri et al. Applicant submits that claim 13 is allowable for at least the reasons set forth above and does not concede the correctness of the Examiner's argument with regard to Lahiri et al. Therefore, Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Allowable Subject Matter

In Section 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that claims 15-18 and 23-33 are allowed.

In Section 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claim 3 as being dependent upon rejected base claim, but indicated that claim 3 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. However, Applicant submits that claim 3 is in condition for allowance as being dependent from independent claim 1, which is believed to be allowable for the reasons set forth above. Therefore, Applicant requests that the objection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In light of the above comments and remarks, Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully requested.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: 

Brian D. Kaul, Reg. No. 41,885
Suite 1400 - International Centre
900 Second Avenue South
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319
Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312

BDK/djb